



**Why and how
to measure structural vulnerability
at the country level**

**By
Patrick Guillaumont**

***MPDD Seminar Series
UN ESCAP, Bangkok - March 6, 2012***



About this seminar

- Initial invitation to present my book *Caught in a trap. Identifying the least developed countries*, a result of my long lasting participation to the CDP
- Participation postponed... waiting for the forthcoming companion volume *Out of the trap. Supporting the least developed countries*
- Recent developments in the analysis of vulnerability and its implications for international economic policy
- Both in relation with the management of the LDC category and with the allocation of international resources

Guillaumont

Caught in a trap

Identifying the least developed countries

Patrick Guillaumont

Caught in a trap

ECONOMICA



Out of the trap

Supporting the least developed countries

Edited by Patrick Guillaumont





This seminar on vulnerability, in brief

- Vulnerability (a multifold concept) matters : by several ways it makes devevelopment unsustainable (able)
- It calls for international measures, focused on most vulnerable poor countries
- This requires a measurement of vulnerability, according to indicators /indices comparable among countries, reliable and likely to be used for these policy purposes: here the identification of the LDCs and the international allocation of resources
- Indices shoud be designed consistently with the kind of vulnerability to be addressed and the issue raised



Vulnerability going up on the international agenda

- Identification of the *Least Developed Countries* (LDCs) as low income countries suffering from structural handicaps to growth, in particular a high vulnerability (explicit since 2000)
- *Small Islands Developing States* (SIDS) concern about vulnerability, from the Barbados (1994) and Mauritius (2004) Conferences... and recent tsunamis
- Concern about civil conflict, post-conflict, *fragile states*
- Increased awareness of vulnerability with the « *multiple crises* » of the end of 2000s: oil prices, food prices, world demand downturn
- And more and more *climate change* and its expected consequences



On the semantics of vulnerability

- Vulnerability, at the *macro* level (as at the *micro* level) is the risk to be hampered by exogenous shocks, either natural or external (...)
- It depends on three main components:
 - likely *size of the shocks*, recurrent or progressive (...)
 - the *exposure* to these shocks
 - the capacity to cope with them or capacity to adapt or *resilience*
- *Structural vulnerability* is the vulnerability that does not depend on the country present will, and is determined only by exogenous and lasting factors (of the three components)
- *General vulnerability* also depends on the country present and future will, that is more rapidly changing, in particular through the resilience component
- Distinctions valid for various kinds of shocks and vulnerability



Vulnerability matters for growth and development

- For *economic growth*, due to many reasons, corresponding either to risk or to asymmetry effects of economic instability
- Even more for *poverty reduction*, because instability makes economic growth, already affected by vulnerability, less pro-poor
- For *policy*, because the quality of policy and institutions is affected by structural vulnerability
- For *sustainability*: not only economic vulnerability matters (vulnerability is the opposite of sustainability), but also because economic shocks have environmental consequences, and environmental shocks economic consequences



Various ways to tackle structural vulnerability(ies)

- Policy responses first depend on the kind of vulnerability to be addressed, economic or environmental (eg commodity price instability or climate change)
- In particular for the actions aiming at reducing vulnerability (eg economic diversification or adaptation to climate change)
- Another and important way to tackle vulnerability is to take it into account in designing international development policies, in particular the allocation of concessional resources (either ODA or adaptation resources)
- It should be done according to the needs generated by structural vulnerability(ies) (either economic or climatic), for what measurable relevant indicators are then needed



Outline of what follows

1. *Designing structural (versus general) vulnerability indicators, not depending on present policy: focus on*
 - the economic vulnerability index (EVI) and
 - the physical vulnerability to climate change index (PVCCI)
2. *Using those two indicators for international development policy, the identification of the LDCs and the allocation of international (concessional) resources:*
 - EVI as criterion for the identification of the LDCs
 - EVI as a criterion for the allocation of (ODA)
 - PVCCI as a criterion for the allocation of adaptation resources

(I)

Designing indicators of structural vulnerability

- Indicators should not depend on present policy
- They should primarily reflect both the likely size of the shocks and the exposure to these shocks
- They should capture either an economic medium-term vulnerability or a long term physical vulnerability to climate change
- Focus on two indicators already calculated as indices
- EVI: the economic vulnerability index (UN CPD)
- PVCCI: a physical vulnerability to climate change index (Ferdi)




Structural economic vulnerability as measured by the Economic Vulnerability Index (EVI)

- Designed by the UN CDP for featuring LDCs, EVI has been set up first in 2000, then revised, mainly in 2005, then slightly in 2011
- Captures only structural components of vulnerability, chosen with regard to their expected (or evidenced) effect on economic growth
- Transparent and parsimonious, EVI relies on
 - 4 main (structural) exposure components (ex ante vulnerability)
 - and 3 (exogenous) shock components, measuring past recurrent shocks, likely to re-occur in the future and to already hamper future economic growth



CDP

Economic Vulnerability Index (EVI)





Resilience kept aside

- General vulnerability also depends on the capacity to react, which mainly depends on policy
- But the capacity to react to some extent also depends on structural factors, the « structural resilience »
- These structural factors of resilience are broad factors, rather well captured by the levels of income pc and human capital
- To be noted , GNIpc and the Human Assets Index (HAI) are along with EVI criteria for the identification of LDCs
- Including them in the vulnerability index would blur the specificity of the vulnerability concept



EVI, by group of countries, from 2006 LDCs review


group of countries	number of countries	Mean
All Developing countries (DCs)	120	45.0
Low-Income Countries	58	47.4
Non-low-income Countries	62	42.8
Least Developed Countries (LDCs)	50	53.4
All Developing countries non LDCs	70	39.1
Low-Income LDCs	43	51.1
Low-Income non-LDCs	15	37.0
LDCs, Low Income non LDCs and transition economies	73	47.79
Small Islands Developing States (SIDS)	29	56.9
SIDS non LDCs	17	51.2
Non-SIDS LDCs	38	49.7
SIDS-LDCs	12	65.0



Lessons from a « retrospective EVI »: LDCs and other developing countries compared


- Retrospective EVI built at Ferdi in cooperation with UN DESA over 1970-2008, for 128 countries, using the same structure and components that for the 2006 and 2009 reviews of the list of LDCs
- The overall index : roughly stagnant in LDCs, decreasing elsewhere
- The exposure index: slightly decreasing , as elsewhere
- The shock index: increasing, decreasing elsewhere...

Evolution of EVI, by group of countries






Evolution of the exposure index, by group of countries



Evolution of the shock index, by group of countries






Changes recently brought in EVI... and challenges

- Changes brought in 2011 for the 2012 review
- Same structure, but
- Among shocks components, homeless population due to natural disasters replaced by population affected...
- And a new exposure component added ,
the % of population living in low coastal area,
same weight being given to each of the new 4 sub-components
- Means a small move to make LDCs countries meeting structural obstacles for sustainable development, rather than only for growth
- Raises a debate about the distinction between economic and climatic vulnerability, besides another one about economic vulnerability and state fragility



Composition of the Economic Vulnerability Index (EVI)

Numbers in parenthesis indicate the weight in the overall EVI.





Structural economic vulnerability and state fragility

- Structural economic vulnerability, distinct from *state fragility*,
- Leads to clearly separate LDCs and fragile states (FS)
- State fragility designed and identified only from present policy and institutional factors: lack of state capacity, political will and legitimacy (many changing definitions)
- Structural economic vulnerability designed from factors (exogenous shocks and exposure) independent of policy
- But structural vulnerability influences state fragility,
- And many LDCs are also FS (most are or have been so)

Economic vulnerability and vulnerability to climate change

- Vulnerability to climate already taken into account through several components of EVI (population affected by natural disasters, instability of agricultural production), and now more specifically by the risk to be flooded due to the sea level rise (an exposure component of vulnerability to climate *change*)
- But vulnerability to climate change differs from the economic vulnerability by its nature (more physical) and time horizon (longer) : it reflects a long term risk of change in geo-physical conditions, not a structural handicap to economic growth in medium term
- And it is vulnerability to only one (major) environmental factor



Which vulnerability to climate change index is needed

- Depends on the goal pursued (many indices available)
- Here an index likely to be used (among others) to allocate resources for adaptation, with the idea to give more to the most vulnerable
- Should be independent not only of the current policy (as EVI), but also of future policy: countries more vulnerable because of a poor present or expected policy/resilience should not be rewarded for that
- Since vulnerability to CC is a quite long term one, it should preferably be captured through *physical* components
- This is the main feature of the recent Ferdi *Physical Vulnerability to Climate Change Index* (PVCCI), as such differing from other attempts (CGD 2011, Barr et al. 2010)


The index of physical vulnerability to climate change: main features

- Forward-looking and likely to capture long term risks
- Relies only on geo-physical components, without any debatable socio-economic component
- So does not include components reflecting the adaptive capacity
- Makes a distinction between two kinds of risks due to climate change
 - risks related to progressive shocks (such as sea level rise) and
 - risks related to the intensification of recurrent shocks (in rainfall or temperature)
- Makes another distinction between the shocks and the exposure to the shocks, and, because the impact of the shocks depends on the initial exposure, uses a geometric averaging
- ... but still tentative



Adaptive capacity kept aside

- Adaptive capacity often considered as a part of climate vulnerability indicators
- As economic resilience for the general economic vulnerability, it is not determined only by present policy factors, and also depends on various structural factors
- But again these structural factors are very broad: including them would lower the specificity of the vulnerability concept
- Better to take them into account separately through indicators such as income pc or human assets index
- Indeed the same as for economic resilience with regard to EVI




NB. The boxes corresponding to the two last rows of the graph respectively refer to exposure components (*in italics*) and to size of the shocks components

PVCCI in several groups of developing countries

group of countries	number of countries	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
All Developing countries (DCs)	116	36.43	35.89	6.77
Least Developed Countries (LDCs)	46	38.28	38.38	8.04
All Developing countries non LDCs	72	35.48	34.77	6.30
Low and Lower Middle Income countries	84	37.64	37.21	7.13
Low and LMI countries non LDCs	39	36.66	36.72	5.92
Small Islands Developing States (SIDS)	29	38.00	34.60	9.42
SIDS non LDCs	18	35.98	34.29	7.51
SIDS-LDCs	11	40.19	38.67	11.85
Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs)	27	37.14	36.87	6.24
LLDCs non LDCs	11	39.43	40.09	4.96
LLDCs-LDCs	16	35.56	33.52	6.67

Physical Vulnerability to Climate Change Index (PVCCI) in developing countries



- A high average level of vulnerability to climate change in Africa

group of countries	PVCCI				PROGRESSIVE SHOCKS				RECURRENT SHOCKS			
	number of countries	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	number of countries	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	number of countries	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
All Developing Countries (DCs)	116	35,96	35,81	6,74	116	24,33	21,53	11,60	142	46.72	45.75	7.48
African Developing Countries	43	37,97	37,63	5,87	43	24,64	23, 37	9,32	47	51,07	50,92	7,18
Least Developed Countries (LDCs)	46	37,93	37,38	7,83	46	24,92	18,80	14,22	49	51.03	51.02	7.58
African LDCs	30	38,11	38,14	5,72	30	23,63	20,09	9,29	32	52,44	52,01	7,14
Low and LMI Countries non LDCs	84	37,25	36,84	7,16	84	25,53	22,37	13,00	95	48.54	48.92	7.50
African Low and LMI Countries	37	37,61	37,65	5,49	37	23,84	21,77	8,86	40	51,25	50,97	7,27

- Sub-Sahara African countries evidence a higher average PVCCI than other DCs
 - level of the risk associated to progressive shocks index is a result of two opposed effects
 - a low impact of the sea level rise in Africa
 - component “increasing aridity” more important for African DCs and the trend in temperature is more increasing in Africa
 - difference between DCs and African DCs is important and non ambiguous for the impact of the increasing recurrent shocks



Mixing the two indices?

- There is a rationale for keeping two separate indices:
 - difference of time horizon
 - difference of scope (economic vs geo-physical expected impacts)
- But combining the two indices in an extended structural vulnerability index is conceivable (only one redundant component in EVI, where it could be deleted)
- The relative weight then given to each of the two indices would reflect the time preference of users, as well as their relative concern about economic growth and environment stability.
- The need of a synthetic index would depend on its possible use for international policy

(II)

Using vulnerability indicators for international policy purposes

- The previous two indicators, can be used for guiding policy:
 1. EVI used for the identification of LDCs
 2. EVI possibly used for the allocation of ODA
 3. PVCCI possibly used for the allocation of adaptation resources
- But each use meets a specific issue
 - (1) the issue of graduation from the LDC category,
 - (2) and (3) the issue of principles and criteria of international resources allocation



EVI as a criterion for the identification of LDCs: inclusion

- Since the origin of the category, 3 complementary criteria to be met: presently these are GNIpc, HAI, and EVI
- Implicit hypothesis that a low human capital and a high vulnerability are reinforcing each other as obstacles to growth, and likely to generate a poverty trap
- An hypothesis non rejected by the econometric tests over a long period




EVI as a criterion for the identification of LDCs: graduation

- For graduation, four precautions to insure the sustainability of progress and avoid disruption effects:
 - criteria thresholds for graduation differ by a margin from those for inclusion;
 - to be recommended for graduation a country has to be found eligible at two successive triennial reviews...
 - and graduation takes place only after three years
 - a country should fail to meet two, rather than only one, of the three criteria (asymmetry) with ordinary thresholds, but only GNIpc if it reaches twice the level of the ordinary threshold
- Thus to no longer meet the EVI criterion not necessarily needed

The asymmetry

FIGURE
Criteria for inclusion and graduation in 2009





Discordant countries as a result from asymmetry...

- ... and more generally from the precautionary process
- Many LDCs, without being eligible to graduation, are no longer eligible to inclusion (18 in 2009)
- And, more unequitable, some LICs nonLDCs, without being eligible to inclusion, would not be eligible to graduation, would they be LDCs (5 in 2009)
- All these may be said « discordant countries »



Reaching EVI threshold, not an actual trigger for graduation

- All the 4 countries graduated (CV, Maldives) or graduating (Samoa, Eq Guinea), have been so because of their level of GNIpc and HAI or GNIpc only
- Some of them, as well as other ones found eligible but not yet recommended, tried to oppose to graduation on the ground they were highly vulnerable, in particular to climate change
- Actually their high vulnerability was reflected in their level of EVI, but their income pc and their level of human capital seem to show them as « out of the trap »



Would a revised EVI have changed eligibility?

- Even a revised EVI underlining their vulnerability, for instance by increasing the weight given to the vulnerability to CC would have not changed the eligibility
- To make vulnerability always taken into account, without reinforcing the (unequitable) asymmetry of the present rule would involve the adoption of new rule, this one symmetrical, with only two criteria, the GNIpc and a structural handicap index (SHI) combining the 2 indices of SH, HAI and EVI with a limited substitutability
- It even might not change the eligibility to graduation



EVI still relevant for graduating countries: « the criteria beyond the category »

- The level of structural vulnerability as captured by EVI, even if it has no present impact of on the eligibility to graduation, can be a tool for the international policy towards graduating countries
- An aid allocation according EVI (and HAI as well) may support a process of « smooth transition »
- And may correspond to a more general need of reform of aid allocation criteria



Geographical allocation of development assistance: the present debate

- Traditional wisdom dominated by the « PBA », the «performance based allocation »: aid should mainly be allocated to countries according to their «performance»
- PBA is first a formula used by the MDBs (and some bilateral donors) for the allocation of their concessional resources, with performance measured by the «CPIA» (Country Policy and Institutional Assessment),
- PBA is also a kind of general principle on which the international community is supposed to agree...
- ... and which is used to assess the allocation quality of the various donors (« selectivity »)
- But is strongly debated



PBA formula (IDA)

- $A_i = \text{CPR}_i^5 \cdot \text{GNIpc}_i^{-0.125} \cdot P_i$
- $\text{CPR}_i = 0.24 \text{ CPIA}_{\text{ABC}} + 0.68 \text{ CPIA}_D + 0.08 \text{ PORT}$

PBA formula (AfDF)

- $A_i = \text{CPA}_i^4 \cdot \text{GNIpc}_i^{-0.125} \cdot P_i$
- $\text{CPA}_i = 0.26 \text{ CPIA}_{\text{ABC}} + 0.58 \text{ CPIA}_D + 0.2 \text{ PPA}$

PBA formula (AsDB): the country allocation share depends on the « Composite country performance rating », (CCPR) which itself depends on...

- $A_i = \text{CCPRI}_i^2 \cdot \text{GNIpc}_i^{-0.25} \cdot P_i^{0.6}$
- $\text{CCPRI}^{2.00} = (\text{policy and institutional rating})i^{1.40} \times (\text{governance rating})i^{2.00} \times (\text{portfolio performance rating})i^{0.60}$



Why a debate?

- PBA gives an overwhelming weight to the assessment of policy and governance of recipient countries (through the « CPIA » and mainly its governance component)
- It does not take into account their vulnerability (although a matter of concern for a long time), neither their distance to the MDGs (in particular in health and education)
- In spite of criticisms, reluctance of some donors to change
- However move of ideas and better appreciation of the need to take vulnerability into account, illustrated by UN SG report to the ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum in 2008 and 2010, by the Joint Ministerial Declaration on Debt Sustainability, from Commonwealth and OIF, 2009, by new initiatives of the AfDB...



Five reasons to improve the PBA... all related to vulnerability

- Restoring the real meaning of performance
- Enhancing equity by compensating structural handicaps and avoiding double punishment
- Drawing lessons of aid effectiveness literature
- Increasing transparency by limiting exceptions
- Looking for stability, predictability and countercyclicality



Restauring the real meaning of performance

- Everybody favours performance
- Genuine performance refers to outcomes with respect to given initial and external conditions
- CPIA is an assessment of policy rather than a real measure of performance
- Moreover a subjective assessment, according uniform norms, what does not fit the alignment and ownership principles
- And it does not take into account the initial and external conditions, such as the vulnerability to shocks



Enhancing equity by compensating structural handicaps and avoiding double punishment

- Aid allocation should look for equity: among countries or individuals, promoting equity means equalizing opportunities, and capabilities
- *Opportunity equalization involves compensating structural handicaps*
- Main structural handicaps of the LICs are vulnerability to exogenous shocks and low level of human capital, two obstacles reinforcing each other, and not taken into account in the PBA
- To be noted, these two handicaps, along with a low level of income pc, are the main features and identification criteria of LDCs
- Moreover, if aid is allocated mainly according governance, populations suffering from bad governance are at the same time penalized by aid allocation: they are punished twice... Bad governance should indeed be taken into account when designing *aid modalities*, more than through aid allocation



Drawing lessons of aid effectiveness literature

- A double main lesson of literature: aid effectiveness is conditional on the features of recipient countries, but
- Although present policy is a significant *positive* factor of growth, its impact on aid effectiveness is *uncertain*
- Although vulnerability is a significant *negative* factor of growth, its impact on aid effectiveness is *positive* (Chauvet & Guillaumont 2001, 2004, 2010; Collier and Goderik, 2010)
- Then legitimate to take vulnerability into account in aid allocation to make it effective...



***Increasing transparency and consistency
by making the rule general and effective
and treating fragile states in an integrated framework***

- Present PBAs are implemented with multiple exceptions: country or per capita caps, floors, and above all special treatment for fragile states or post conflict countries
- These exceptions weaken the relationship between « performance » and allocation , making the allocation rules little transparent
- Treatment of FS/ PCC in aid allocation should be not only transitional and curative, as it is, but also permanent and preventive, through the consideration of structural vulnerability



Making the allocation more stable, more predictable and less procyclical

- Amplified effects of small changes of policy rating (CPIA, CPR, CPA, CCPR...) on allocation, due the structure of the formula (high rating elasticity of allocation)
- Instability of the rating itself
- Procyclicality of CPIA with regard to exogenous shocks
- Taking into account structural handicaps should make allocation less sensitive to policy and governance rating, more stable and less procyclical



Possible approaches to an improvement

- Followingly, robust rationale for taking into account structural vulnerability, as well as a low level of human capital in aid allocation
- Can be done by using available and commonly agreed indicators, such as EVI (for structural vulnerability) and HAI (for human capital), used at UN for LDCs identification along with GNIpc, also a relevant aid allocation criterion
- To be still possibly included , with a lower weight than presently, an appropriate indicator of “performance/policy ”
- Should meet the three principles of equity , effectiveness and transparency (and simplicity)
- Two main ways of addressing previous issues :
 - EVI (and HAI) included within an “ augmented PBA ”
 - EVI (and HAI) included as a component of a simple allocation formula balancing effectiveness and equity goals



Performance vs vulnerability, also an issue with regard to climate change funding

- More and more resources will be devoted to the *adaptation* to climate change.
- The allocation of these resources meets the same issue as ODA
- Presently also ruled by performance/policy (eg GEF), with specific reference to environment policy, but without a clear rationale
- Since low-income countries are not responsible for climate change, it is equitable that the concessional funds for adaptation be allocated mainly according to the vulnerability to climate change
- For equity and effectiveness, need to consider *physical vulnerability to climate change*, through an indicator such as PVCCI, not dependent on policy



Criteria for the allocation of adaptation resources: common features with ODA

- A weak *capacity to adapt* for reasons not depending on present policy (ie a low structural resilience), legitimating a higher allocation in both cases, should also be considered separately ,and can be captured by the low level of GNIpc and HAI
- But a low *performance rating* (policy and governance), also named capacity to implement (in the climate change literature), as an effectiveness criterion , may lead to a lower allocation (with a smaller weight than presently)
- It may also lead to *specific modalities* of support (projects vs budget)



Criteria for the allocation of adaptation resources: may debate differ from that on ODA?

- Reference to structural vulnerability, because it is more clearly exogenous (physical) more easily accepted (shocks and exposure): can the ODA allocation debate be influenced by the climate one?
- Reference to effectiveness (« performance ») may in both cases be also needed , but not clear what kind of performance is relevant for the adaptation to climate change :
 - environmental performance? a moral, but debatable argument
 - general performance: the same factors have an impact on the effectiveness of development and of adaptation
- Differentiation more logical if performance assessment includes a judgement on projects implementation, as far as projects differ



Mixing the two allocation processes?

- Economic development and adaptation in poor countries are very close goals
- Although additionality is officially supposed, resources for the two goals are likely to be partial substitute
- If the two kinds of resources were merged, their geographical allocation should be treated simultaneously and the two kinds of vulnerability could then be measured through a synthetic index
- While the allocation for mitigation would be treated differently
- Anyway trade-off between goals, their time horizon and the component weights of the index, is unescapable
- Allocation of international resources, a policy choice



More details from the author in

- Chauvet, L., and P. Guillaumont (2009), "Aid, Volatility and Growth Again. When Aid Volatility Matters and When it Does Not" *Review of Development Economics*, 13(3), 452–463
- Guillaumont, P. (2009), "An Economic Vulnerability Index: Its Design and Use for International Development Policy", *Oxford Development Studies*, 37 (3), September, 193-228
- Guillaumont, P. (2009) *Caught in the trap. Identifying the least developed countries*, Economica
- Guillaumont P.; (2010) "Assessing the Economic Vulnerability of Small Island Developing States and the Least Developing Countries", *Journal of Development Studies* Vol 46, No 5, 828-854, May
- Guillaumont, P. (2006), "Macro vulnerability in low income countries and aid responses", in *Securing Development in an Unstable World* (F. Bourguignon, B. Pleskovic, and J. van der Gaag, Eds) ABCDE Europe 2005, Word Bank, 65-108
- P. Guillaumont, S. Guillaumont Jeanneney (2009) "Accounting for Vulnerability of African Countries in Performance Based Aid Allocation" *African Development Group Working Paper* No. 103, October 2009
- ---- (2009) "State fragility and economic vulnerability. What is measured and why?" Background paper of the *European Report on Development* and *Ferdi Working Paper*
- ---- (2010), "Big Push versus Absorptive Capacity. How to Reconcile the Two Approaches" in Mavrotas (edr), *Foreign Aid for Development*, Oxford University Press, 297-320.
- ---- 2010 "Why stick to the wrong way in aid allocation?", *Ferdi Policy Brief*, March
- P. Guillaumont, S. Guillaumont Jeanneney, and L. Wagner (2010) "How to take into account vulnerability in aid allocation and lack of human capital as well: improving the performance based allocation" *Ferdi Working Paper*, P13, October
- Guillaumont, P. M. McGillivray and L. Wagner (2010) "Performance Assessment, Vulnerability, and Human Capital in the Allocation of Aid among Countries" ABCDE Conference, Stockholm, forthcoming




T h a n k s


Symmetry vs asymmetry with 2 criteria

Asymmetry compared with symmetry

a. Asymmetrical inclusion and graduation rules (the present approach)



b. Symmetrical inclusion and graduation rules (an alternative approach)



Symmetry vs asymmetry with 3 criteria

